

## CRITERIA TO EVALUATE POTENTIAL NEXUS PROJECTS

(1) State Interest: Which project considered would attract the most number of *additional* state participants to the National Nexus Program?

Evaluation range: High– most non-member states would likely be attracted to join the NNP as a result of this project.

Medium– about half of the non-member states would likely be attracted to join the NNP as a result of this project.

Low– few of the non-member states would likely be attracted to join the NNP as a result of this project.

(2) Feasibility: For which project would the Nexus Committee be willing to shift Nexus resources from ongoing Nexus activities, or provide additional state funding?

Evaluation range: High– the Nexus Committee would be very likely to shift resources to support this project.

Medium– the Nexus Committee would be somewhat likely to shift resources to support this project.

Low– the Nexus Committee would be unlikely to shift resources to support this project.

(3) Impact: Which project would most boost the Commission’s reputation by increased attention from the SALT press, by being unique in the SALT community including FTA, TEI, SEATA, Big 4, etc.?

Evaluation range: High – this project would be very likely to increase the NNP’s reputation.

Medium – this project would be somewhat likely to increase the NNP’s reputation.

Low – this project would be unlikely to increase the NNP’s reputation.

(4) Topical Urgency: What keeps state people up at night? What creates pressure from taxpayers or others? Is this project designed to address an urgent problem?

Evaluation range: High – this project is very likely to address an urgent nexus issue or problem.

Medium – this project is somewhat likely to address an urgent nexus issue or problem.

Low – this project is unlikely to address an urgent nexus issue or problem.